UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/594,317 | 08/17/2007 | Akira Umeda | 04208.0245 | 2082 |
| | 7590 06/23/200 ENDERSON, FARAE | EXAMINER | | |
| LLP | , | RAEVIS, ROBERT R | | |
| 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2856 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/23/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/594,317 | UMEDA, AKIRA | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Robert R. Raevis | 2856 | | |

| | Robert N. Naevis | 2030 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>10 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o | which places the r (3) a Request | | | | |
| The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejection | on. | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | r). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee be action; or (2) as | | | | |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be | filed within two month | e of the date of | | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | cause | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | • | | | | | | |
| (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or | | | ne issues for | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | | ected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1) | * ** | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>16,19 and 20</u> would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | • | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 6-9,17,18 and 21-23. Claim(s) objected to: | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>16,19,20 and 24-29</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail | s to provide a | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | | |
| | /Robert R. Raevis/ | | | | | | |
| | Primary Examiner, Art U | Init 2856 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 30 is a new combination, with additional note being made that it's a method and that it did not include jig adjustment of claim 24..

Continuation of 13. Other: As to the foot note on p. 8 of REMARKS, the material on p. 14, lines 13+, to p. 15, line 22, of the written specification was was incorrectly treated as prior art in the non-final office action. Those two pages 14-15 provide a "DISCLOSURE OF THE INVENTION", and are not in the "BACKGROUND ART" of the written specification. As this statement is also found in the Final Office action, there should be no question as to what is prior art in this regard.